DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 789 CE 027 472

TITLE	Program Evaluation in Vocational Rehabilitation: Observations.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Needs; Models; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Records (Forms); Research Design; Research Methodology; Research Reports; Resource Materials; State Programs; Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	Delaware; Michigan; Mississippi; Oregon; Pennsylvania; Virginia

ABSTRACT

This group of reports constitutes the first series of observations designed to document the experiences of six state agencies (Delaware, Oregon, Michigan, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi) which are developing model program evaluation/management support units that will affect the development and implementation of policy in federal/state programs for vocational rehabilitation (VR). In the first report the failure of program evaluation in rehabilitation is traced to the fact that counselors are not neccesarily evaluators, to the existence of vague and ambiguous VR goals, and to faulty evaluation methodology. Efforts in the development of VR program evaluation criteria are discussed in the second report on the relationship of program evaluation and VR agencies. In the third and fourth reports the Pennsylvania and Mississippi model evaluation units document their experiences in the formation of their model units. Suggestions and forms for managing information requests dealing with VR evaluation are provided in the fifth report. Two book reviews (the first on Joseph S. Wholey's Evaluation: Promise and Performance and the second on Scarvia Anderson and Samuel Ball's The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation) constitute the final two reports. Appendixes include a bibliography of program evaluation literature and a list of periodicals and journals relating to rehabilitation and evaluation. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195789

774119

Program Evaluation in Vocational Rehabilitation:

OBSERVATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shirley M. Hufstedler, *Secretary*
Edwin W. Martin, *Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services*
Rehabilitation Services Administration
Frederick Sachs, *Acting Commissioner*

CE 027 472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEC 4 1980

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Rehabilitation Services Administration. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Rehabilitation Services Administration or of the U. S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by them should be inferred.

FOREWORD

The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), initiated the "Comprehensive State VR Program and Policy Systems Through Development of Model Evaluation/Management Information Support Units" within State Departments of Vocational Rehabilitation in 1978. These evaluation demonstrations have produced some rewarding experiences. This publication is the first of twelve scheduled over the next three years. Each edition will feature articles written by the principal investigators of the model units, federal personnel, staff of firms and agencies under contract to RSA, and evaluation experts in the rehabilitation field. We will devote particular attention to providing information on achievements and barriers experienced by the model units over their three year existence. We will also keep readers posted on trends in program evaluation in rehabilitation, initiatives underway to build state evaluation capacity, and other general and technical evaluation subjects as we progress. In light of the demonstrated efforts of the model units. many of their accomplishments will have implications for future policy changes in program evaluation at the national and state levels of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

James E. Taylor, Ph.D.
Project Officer, RSA

PREFACE

The primary purpose of this series of reports is to document the experiences of six state agencies that are developing systems to impact upon the development and implementation of policy in the Federal/state program for vocational rehabilitation.

On October 1, 1978, the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) entered into a contractual agreement (one year duration with the option for two additional years) with six state Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Agencies to develop model program evaluation/management information support units. The contracts were awarded on the basis of the technical merit of proposals submitted in response to a Request For Proposals (RFP). The states receiving the contracts were:

Delaware (a small general agency)
Oregon (a small general agency)
Michigan (a medium sized general agency)
Virginia (a medium sized general agency)
Pennsylvania (a large general agency)
Mississippi (an agency for the blind)

The objectives for the Model Evaluation Units (MEUs) were to: 1) develop a model in which comprehensive program and policy systems were linked by appropriate evaluation data; 2) field test and evaluate the effectiveness of the (revised) Federal Program Evaluation Standards and the Facilities Information System for VR agency management; 3) build new evaluation capacity which can be generalized to other states; and 4) develop linkages for a within-state agency and between-state agency network for communication, dissemination and utilization of evaluation topics, with special emphasis on developing and testing the Model Evaluation Units.

In order to meet these objectives, the Model Evaluation Units were required by their first year's contract to perform the following tasks:

1. Plan and organize the Model Evaluation Units;
2. Initiate and establish continuing working relationships with associated organizations, contractors and university resources;
3. Administratively monitor the organization of the Evaluation Unit;
4. Field Test the new (revised) Federal Program Evaluation Standards;
5. Field Test the Vocational/Medical Facilities Information System;
6. Develop New Evaluation Capacity;
7. Assure dissemination and utilization of products;
8. Evaluate the project, and
9. Submit yearly and final reports.

On October 1, 1971, RSA, after competitive bidding, awarded a contract to the West Virginia Research and Training Center (WVRTC) to coordinate the activities, of MEU development. The primary functional responsibilities of the WVRTC are to provide coordination, promote technical assistance, monitor activities, develop models, conduct evaluations, and prepare articles and other materials for dissemination. The specific tasks of the WVRTC for the most part coincide with those of the MEUs; however; additional tasks include the development of a regional office (RSA) model for the use of evaluation data generated by state VR agencies and the development of a set of manuscripts that will be instructive to other agencies who want to incorporate MEU concepts/products into their program evaluation units.

Two other contracts have been awarded by RSA to provide specialized assistance for Tasks 4 and 5. Task 4, to pretest the New (Revised) Federal Program Evaluation Standards, will be facilitated by Berkeley Planning Associates (BPA). BPA developed the new standards under a previous contract with RSA. Their involvement with the MEUs includes the pretesting and refinement of the proposed performance, procedural, and project standards. Activities will include designing instruments for data gathering, training the states in instrument use, coordinating the pretest, analyzing the data, revising standards as necessary, and preparing an implementation plan.

Walker Associates, (WA), under an agreement with the National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, will be providing specialized assistance to the Model Evaluation Units in the conduct of Task 5 - Pretest the Facilities Information System (FIS). The FIS was developed by WA under a previous contract with RSA. The major tasks that WA will be conducting include training for MEUs in the use of the FIS, pretest implementation assistance, monitoring and evaluation of the pretest experience, revision of the system where necessary, and the development of recommendations for nationwide implementation.

The reports of this project will contain (a) issue papers that raise questions and suggest answers in generic evaluation problems; (b) descriptive reports of the methods employed and results of particular evaluation studies; (c) "how to do it" articles; and (d) reports documenting the experience of the various staffs. These reports will be published quarterly for a period of three (3) years.

This first series of observations contains an issue paper by the West Virginia Research and Training Center that deals with the determination of evaluability as the first step in program evaluation. An historical perspective of evaluation in VR is the main thrust of an article by the Virginia MEU. The Pennsylvania and Mississippi MEUs document their experiences in the formation of their model units. The Oregon MEU provides a "how to do it article" on dealing with information requests. Two book reviews are also included, as well as three informational appendices.

Dr. Richard A. Nida
Project Officer
August, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword	James E. Taylor, Ph.D.	iii
Preface	Richard A. Nida, Ph.D.	v
Tracing the Failure of Program Evaluation in Vocational Rehabilitation	Richard A. Nida, Ph.D.	1
Program Evaluation and Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies	W. H. Brownfield and John E. Hayek	7
The Durability of a Model Evaluation Unit	William E. Jenkins, Ed.D.	12
Establishing a Program Evaluation Unit Within Mississippi Vocational Rehabilitation for the Blind		17
Managing Requests for Evaluation Information	Laurilee B. Hatcher	25
Evaluation: Promise and Performance (Book Review)		35
The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation (Book Review)		38
Appendix I - Program Evaluation Literature		39
Appendix II - Periodicals and Journals Relating to Rehabilitation and Evaluation		41
Appendix III - Model Evaluation Units Project - Advisory Committee		46

TRACING THE FAILURES OF PROGRAM EVALUATION IN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

RICHARD A. NIDA, PH.D.
WEST VIRGINIA RESEARCH & TRAINING CENTER

Many social services programs that flourished during the sixties found that the seventies brought a cessation to growth and in many instances a reduction in available program funds. In vocational rehabilitation (VR), 1972 marked the end of real growth (when the total allocation is corrected for inflation). The subsequent reduction in allocations for program parallels the increased emphasis and funding for program evaluation (PE) activities.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) provided the basis for the extended requirements and capabilities within state agencies for VR. Funding for program evaluation activities at the central office of the Rehabilitation Services Administration increased to $1 million in 1974 and to nearly $2.5 million in 1978. Precise assessments for monies expended at the state level are not readily available, but it is safe to say that state expenditures at least equal the Federal ones.

The very real decrease in program funds, coupled with a growing skepticism about the impact of services, in part forced the growth of program evaluation. Presumably, in a time of scarce resources, evaluation would provide the necessary information about program operation that would allow managers and policymakers to make decisions to improve the quality of those programs. To date, the promise of program evaluation is yet to be realized.

Schmidt, Scanlon, and Bell (1979) noted that program evaluation has not led to successful programs and has produced little information of utility or even interest to managers and policymakers. What, then, has led to the failure of program evaluation?

Stock Answers for VR PE Failures

The most often listed reasons for the lack of effectiveness of program evaluation in state VR agencies have been that PE is "new"; and that the evaluators are, in most instances, former counselors who have not had formal training in evaluation techniques.

How New is "New"?

Prior to 1960 a reference to program evaluation was difficult to find in any social services literature.

Evaluation, as well as systematic planning, in the state/Federal rehabilitation program was first begun with the statewide planning and the continuing statewide studies initiated by Federal legislation in 1965. This legislation authorized two-year planning grants for state rehabilitation agencies to evaluate rehabilitation programs and to delineate the steps necessary for the development of adequate vocational rehabilitation resources and programs within each state. Additionally, states were required to coordinate rehabilitation planning with other statewide planning activities and with citizen involvement.

The amendments to the 1968 legislation specifically required state agencies to evaluate the services they were providing. In addition to the requirement, Federal funds for evaluation of VR programs were first made available in 1968. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) further extended the requirements and capabilities for evaluation within Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies. This law contained several provisions that specifically impacted on evaluation, but Section 401 is primarily of interest. Section 401 details the reporting requirements of the Secretary to Congress and gives instructions that "evaluations shall be conducted by persons not immediately involved in the administration of the program or project evaluated."

Section 401(b) of the Act required the Secretary to "develop and publish general standards for evaluation of the program and project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this Act." Further, it specified that the Secretary shall consider the extent to which such standards have been met in deciding whether to review supplemental financial assistance authorized under any section of the Act. Interim evaluation standards were published in the Federal Register on July 2, 1974, and final regulations were published in the Federal Register on December 19, 1975. Presently the evaluation standards have been revised and are awaiting field testing as part of the contracts of the six model units.

Program evaluation is "new" to VR. It is new, period. Twenty years is not a long time frame for a discipline to develop. The first stock answer does appear to explain some of the PE failures to date, but that reason becomes less viable with each passing day.

Counselors Aren't Necessarily Evaluators.

When VR agencies were first faced with the requirement to staff a program evaluation unit, many of them placed either former or actively practicing counselors into the position(s). A survey of evaluators in state VR agencies conducted just prior to the enactment of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Ridge, 1973) indicated that most evaluation personnel did not have formal training in either the theoretical or operational components of evaluation. The background of most staff members was grounded in rehabilitation rather than evaluation. Spaniol (1975) also indicated that evaluation personnel were uncomfortable with present skill levels and needed training in evaluation methodologies.

The initial skill level of these counselors turned evaluators was indeed inadequate, but advanced training and on-the-job skill acquisitions has resulted in increased evaluation expertise at VR agencies. Additionally, many agencies are now recruiting evaluation specialists from outside the agency to further build evaluation capacity. Again, the stock answer while operative is losing its explanatory power. Other factors must then be the source of the continued failure of program evaluation to effectively impact VR program and policies.

Potential Sources of Evaluation Problems

One need not look far to find potential sources of evaluation problems in state VR agencies. Two examples include the VR program itself and the evaluation methodology most often in VR settings.

VR Program

Van Maanen (1979) identified the basic evaluation question as "To what extent is the program actually reaching its goals?" (p. 43). This kind of goal attainment model is the most often used in VR agencies (Cook and Cooper, 1978). As many writers have noted program goals and objectives are often vague, ambiguous, changeable, difficult to specify, and even incompatible with each other within a given program.

Given that the program evaluator rarely sets the goals and objectives of the agency, difficulty in evaluating the extent to which the program is meeting a set of vague, ambiguous, changeable, difficult to specify the potentially incompatible goals is apparent. Is it any wonder then that the VR program and evaluation activities have proceeded essentially on parallel tracks without impacting each other?

If a primary purpose of evaluation is to contribute to the decision making process (Weiss, 1972; Spaniol, 1977), then the clear specification of the program and its goals and objectives is a necessary precondition to conducting a meaningful evaluation. An additional precondition listed by Rutman (1977) is a rationale that links the program to its goals and objectives. Too often the administrators of the state VR program and the VR evaluator have failed to assure that these necessary preconditions were present before proceeding with an effective evaluation of a program.

The heavy emphasis placed upon goal setting and specification in this document does not preclude program benefits occuring either as a result of unintended consequences or unexpressed goals. In fact other evaluation approaches such as a systems approach or goal-free evaluation argue against the goal attainment approach most frequently used in VR as being inadequate. The implication for VR evaluators is thus to identify unexpressed goals and unintended consequences and incorporate them into the goals attainment model.

Evaluation Methodology

Specific methods of conducting evaluation studies are not discussed here; however, a method for determining if the above mentioned preconditions have been met is described in brief. This methodology is known as "evaluability assessment." An evaluation publication of the General Accounting Office (Assessing Social Program Impact Evaluation: A Checklist Approach, 1978) makes the rather obvious point that a program's evaluability should be made early in the evaluation planning process; however, most state VR agency evaluators bypass what is logically one of the most important first steps.

Evaluability assessments have grown out of the work of Dr. Joseph Wholey of the Urban Institute who conducted most of the developmental work for the Bureau of Health Planning (Schmidt, et al, 1979). The methodology is perhaps best articulated in the book by Wholey (1977), Evaluation: Promise and Performance (reviewed later in another section), but in summary form.

> "Evaluability assessment explores the objectives, expectations, and information needs of program managers and policy-makers; explores program reality; assesses the likelihood that program activities will achieve measurable progress toward program objectives; and assesses the extent to which evaluation information is likely to be used by program management. The products of evaluability assessment are: (1) a set of agreed-on program objectives, important side effects, and performance indicators on which the program can realistically be held accountable; and (2) a set of evaluation/management options which represent ways in which management can change program activities, objective, or uses of information in ways likely to improve program performance (p. xiii)."

Generally, most of the efforts involving evaluability assessments have occurred at the Federal level. This is also true in VR.

Example of an Evaluability Assessment in VR.

The Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) recently asked the Office of Technical Assistance of the Assistant Secretary for Program Evaluation within the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct an evaluability assessment of the RSA program. The EA will, through a series of interviews with representatives of public interest groups, governmental control agencies, congressional committees, policy-makers at the department level, RSA central and regional office managers, and state and local VR agency personnel explore:

1. the program objectives, expectations, and assumptions of policy-makers and managers in charge of the program;

2. the objective of political groups;

3. the extent to which management's program objectives have been defined in measurable terms; the program activities actually under way;

4. the likelihood that program activities will achieve measurable progress toward program objectives;

5. the likely use of information in program performance; and

6. options for change in program activities, objectives, and use of information that could enhance program performance.

The results of the evaluability assessment will determine whether program evaluation can be used to alter the performance of the program. An affirmative response would indicate that RSA top management can be held responsible for agency performance in a logical and meaningful fashion. The program will have established its evaluability by meeting the pre-conditions of a clear expression of program, program goals and objectives, and a rationale between program and goals and objectives. A negative response to the evaluability assessment could, of course, require the redefinition of the program, its goals, or the rationale that links the two.

State agencies for VR need to follow the lead of RSA in this respect and initiate evaluability studies of their own programs to insure that time is not lost in conducting evaluations that do not have a reasonable expectation of impacting upon program performnce. The future failures or successes of program evaluation may very well hang in the balance.

REFERENCES

Cook, D. and Cooper, P. Fundamentals of Evaluation Research in Vocational Rehabilitation. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Research and Training Center, 1978.

Edge, S.S. Survey of State Program Evaluation Practices (Working Paper No. 209/RS 20). Berkeley, California: Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, April, 1973.

Rutman, L. Ed. Evaluation Research Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Schmidt, L.E., Scanlon, J.W., and Bell, J.B. Evaluability Assessment: Making Public Programs Work Better. Human Services Monograph Series.14, November, 1979.

Spaniol, L. Program Evaluation Models for Rehabilitation Agencies and Facilities. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration. July, 1977, pp. 4-13.

Spaniol, L. Program Evaluation Models for Rehabilitation: A Review of the Literature (Series 3, Monograph XVII) Rehabilitation Research Institute, the University of Wisconsin, Madision, 1975.

United State General Accounting Office. Assessing Social Program Impact Evaluation: A Checklist Approach. Washington, D.C., 1978.

Van Maanen, L. The Process of Program Evaluation. The Grantsmanship Center News. 5, 1, 1979, pp. 29-74.

Weiss, C. (Ed.) Evaluating Action Programs. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Wholey, J.S. Evaluation: Promise and Performance. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES

W.H.BROWNFIELD & JOHN E. HAYEK
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION SERVICES

Interest in program evaluation is a relatively new development in the social service field. Schulberg and Blaker (1969) indentify post World War II as the start of program evaluation in Public Health. Rossi and Williams (1972) see the major impetus for program evaluation stemming from social action programs of the 1960's. Concerns for program evaluation has arisen for various reasons, of which most commonly cited are accountability of human service organizations, and a questioning of the value of new programs.

The purpose of this paper is to look at some of the literature of program evaluation in general, highlight the major problems facing program evaluation, discuss the applications of program evaluation to vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies and consider the implications of program evaluation within state and Federal rehabilitation programming.

Program evaluation has been defined as:

> ...a systematic continuous process of providing information about the value or worthwhileness of a program for purposes of decision making. (Spaniol, 1975, p.2)

This definition has several concepts the author emphasized to show that program evaluation provides deliberate, on-going, planned assistance to decision makers.

Programs requiring evaluation may be as small as a unit serving one disability group or as large as the agency. The important thing is not the size of the program, but the type of information needed to make informed decisions. Thus, at any level program evaluation can be employed for a number of reasons. For us the most important is its use in decision making concerning (1) program installation, (2) program continuation, and (3) program modification.

Information for program installation is considered to be planning information. It includes such things as needs assessment, cost estimates and operational feasibility. Information from evaluations for program continuation is the traditional view of evaluation. It is the evaluation that is concerned with outputs and products of a program. Another name for this type of evaluation is a performance audit. Finally, information for program modification generally emphasizes processes, and managers may consider this type of evaluation as a management audit.

A major difficulty in program evaluation is the lack of utilization of results. (Anderson and Ball, 1978. Horst and Others, 1974. Rossie and Williams, 1972) There appear to be two sources for this difficulty; one is management based and the other is based in evaluation methodology. In either case, if the results are not used the evaluation effort is of little value to the agency or manager.

Management-based lack of utilization of results is seen as a critical problem cause by a lack of program definition (vague objectives), a lack of the use of clear logic (unjustified assumptions), or a lack of management (management unable or unwilling to use results). (Horst and Others, 1974) Rossi and Williams (1972) see the conceptual application of evaluation to social services as the difficulty.

The second source of difficulty in utilizing evaluation results begins with methodology and includes management problems. Thus, evaluators must face methodological problems (statistics, samples, control groups, variable specifications); bureaucratic problems (manager/evaluator conflict); political problems (technical ability within the organization to conduct complex studies). (Rossi and William, 1972)

The difficulties mentioned here will, at some point, have to be dealt with - to ignore the complexities of methodology, the difficulties concerned with management and the realities of politics would render only lip service to any program evaluation effort.

As mentioned earlier, program evaluation is a relatively new emphasis in the social service field. For vocational rehabilitation it can probably be considered still in its infancy. Pressures to conduct program evaluation in rehabilitation have been both external and internal. The emphasis on increased accountability in recent legislation is a major external pressure. Idealism behind programs must now be supported by more concrete measures to show program worth and justification. Programs with social value must be quantifiable. If the program depends on emotional appeal for support it must also be shown how its intentions are being accomplished. Internal pressure is viewed as stemming from the need for more information upon which to base decisions, increased emphasis on policy analysis, increasing professionalism at all levels of the rehabilitation system, and the interest in evaluating the outcome (impact) of rehabilitation services. (Spaniol, 1975)

In response to the pressures for program evaluation (PE), the early 1970's was a time of developing units, identifying personnel and beginning initial evaluation studies. (Miller, Lee, et al, 1977) Within the VR program several difficulties in program evaluation implementation were identified. These include: the lack of appropriate staff training; the lack of conceptual framework for program evaluation; the lack of methodologies related to outcome evaluation; a tendency to isolate program evaluation from agency program development activities; data quality and consistency; inability to specify outcomes; and the need for better measures of outcome. (Miller, Lee, et al, 1977)

Vocational rehabilitation agencies, in trying to meet the intent of legislation as it pertains to evaluation, have themselves identified much of what has been discussed. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) initially attempted to guide PE focus in three major areas: eligible population, process and outcome. (Rubin, 1974) Within states the emphasis has been on information for planning, monitoring and program revision. (Crystal, Harrison and Miller, 1978) It seems clear that program evaluation in general and within the rehabilitation community have common goals and difficulties. The latter part of this paper will review how evaluation has evoloved in VR, what is presently happening, and, we hope, provide some insight on future directions of PE within VR.

The 1965 Amendment to the VR Act provided some of the impetus for evaluation in VR. Further impetus came with the Amendments of 1968 which outlined requirements for evaluation efforts on an ongoing basis. The RSA then asked states to describe in their Program and Financial Plans for 1973 what evaluation efforts they were pursuing. But probably the most important "motivator" to state VR agencies' evaluation efforts came with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

It was in this Act that the General Evaluation Standards were mandated. It was at this point that some rather specific evaluation efforts were required by RSA from the state agencies. Thus, probably for the first time in the 60 plus year history of VR programs, some specific and discrete evaluation data and information were required by the Federal agency. However, no additional funding to the agencies was provided. As a result, while all state VR agencies were involved in program evaluation, the sophistication of the evaluation efforts ranged from simple casework reviews to elaborate evaluation methodologies. Program evaluation meant different things to different agencies and the direction was not toward any one uniform programmatic end as the General Evaluation Standards published in 1975 were to require.

Reaction to the General Evaluation Standards as published in the Federal Register was, to say the least, mixed. At this writing, some five years later, the original attitudes of the various state agency directors and administrators have not changed much!

In an effort to aid state agencies in their evaluation building capacity, RSA designated somewhat over $750,000.00 of its 1978 funds to be used to provide contract dollars to six state VR agencies. These contracts, awarded on a competitive basis, were intended to allow state agencies to develop "model program evaluation/management information units." Fully integrated into these "model unit" contracts were plans to field test other RSA evaluation areas being developed, e.g., the new Federal Evaluation Standards developed by Berkeley Planning Associates, and the Facility Information System developed by Walker and Associates. The inclusion of these two field tests into the model unit contracts represents a significant new thrust by RSA to test new systems in VR agencies prior to possible nationwide implementation.

The field tests will allow RSA to gather information related to the validity and reliability of the data collection instrument proposed, the usefulness of the data to the state agencies, the costs, both actual dollars and staff time required to implement the standards and facilities systems, and the states' overall reaction to the two proposed activities. The results of these field tests will allow RSA to have definitive input from state VR agencies on their proposed systems and standards prior to national implementation. It is hoped that these pretests will provide for a more useful and palatable product at both the Federal and state levels.

The model units' pretest activities of the new standards and the Facility Information System comprise only part of the overall evaluation system being developed at RSA. In addition, the RSA Management Information System (MIS) is undergoing development through a contract with Abt Associates, Inc. In an effort to allow for state agency involvement and input into this developmental effort, the six model unit states, as well as other states, have been invited to review and comment on the MIS as it is being developed by Abt Associates.

Still another evaluation effort being promulgated by RSA is the states' use of the San Diego Case Review Schedule (CRS) developed by the Regional Rehabilitation Continuing Education Program (RRCEP) at San Diego State University. This instrument assesses compliance of casework activity with Federal regulations and guidelines. RSA has provided a long-term training grant to the San Diego RRCEP to provide every VR agency training in the use of the CRS over the next three to five years.

These four efforts (new standards, FIS, the RSA- MIS and the CRS) appear to reflect an increasing concern by RSA to move forward with systems and efforts which will allow for more uniform evaluation of VR programs nationally. The model unit contracts encourage the development of new evaluation capacity which can be generalized to other state agencies.

Collectively the six MU states are involved in numerous areas of developmental work. These areas include similar benefits model system evaluation, needs assessment for independent living programs, management paradigms, new evaluation use of data systems, installation and use of word processing equipment in evaluation, case closure (case analysis) systems, management information needs assessment, client follow-up approaches and many more.

One of the major thrusts of the MU contracts is in the area of dissemination and utilization of contract activities. A concentrated effort is planned by the six MUs to make this information on their activities available to other VR agencies. These efforts will include a newsletter of what is "going on" in the six states, a special "manuscript" publication which will cover specific contract products in some detail and at least one national conference, probably in the early fall of 1981, to give all VR agencies a chance to "shop" among the six states and examine the products they have developed.

It appears to us that RSA is attempting to provide "seed money" to the six MU states. With those funds and the products developed all other VR agencies will have available to them new evaluation tools, methods or systems to which they might not otherwise have access. The MU state agencies have the responsibility with RSA to share and, where possible, provide technical assistance to states which wish to pursue the possible implementation of any product developed as a part of the MU contracts.

The activities mentioned here are all a part of a new Federal interest and effort to move program evaluation in VR into a new era, albeit these efforts in and of themselves will not be enough. They do, however, represent a significant new "push" to respond to state and Federal legislators' desire for accountability.

Program evaluation's future directions can be summed up as "...one reasonable way to close the gap between program decision making, program execution and program revision." (Brown and Pethtel, 1974, p. 318) For this to happen however, there are four requisites:

1. Program evaluation must become a function of management.

2. Evaluators must be aware of and function within the political arena.

3. Program evaluators must accept that there is a core of skills (management oriented and methodological) necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of the position.

4. RSA must continue developmental efforts in the area of program evaluation.

Finally, Peter Drucker, in his comments on public administration, states, "One can only learn by feedback, and we know that feedback from results always improves performance capacity and effectiveness." (1980, p. 104) Program evaluation can be the mechanism that provides feedback to improve performance capacity and effectiveness. The feedback will be in terms of counselor and caseload performance, ways to present information in a timely fashion for use by decision makers (standards, FIS, RSA, MIS and CRS), benefit-cost analyses, better ways to integrate resources, client long term follow-up and follow-along, and the assessment of other agency outputs such as staff work and other support services.

THE DURABILITY OF A MODEL EVALUATION UNIT

WILLIAM W. JENKINS, ED. D.
PENNSYLVANIA BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The specifications for this contract required the development of a "Model" Program Evaluation and Management Information Support Unit. In this context the term "model" would appear to have several levels of meaning. A model might be considered to be an ideal of exemplary method of functioning. This was clearly one aspect of the Rehabilitation Service Administration's (RSA) intentions since the six state units were to serve as examples that "given sufficient resources, State Agencies, regardless of size, can develop effective evaluation capacity" (U.S. Office of Human Development Services, 1978). However, a model also has a theoretical or scientific level of meaning which is to serve as "a representation of the underlying structure of a process or system. The system might be conceptual, ideal, or real. In general, a model has a simple and/or manipulatable structure relative to the system it represents. By making explicit the implications of alternative assumptions regarding key relationships of the issue or system under study, a model can provide a clearer understanding of these relationships" (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1978). We now recognize model construction and model description as an essential portion of the contract's work. The Request for Proposal (RFP) contributed to the process of model articulation by specifically requiring a continuing series of deliverables on the conceptual framework, operational tracking system, and evaluation plan. In doing so, it provided both a focus for many of the conceptual activities and parameters for them.

These activities, at first glance, would appear to comprise a series of logical and rational functions which could be conducted at a relatively abstract level. However, in an organization which already had an established Program Evaluation Unit with its own identity and history, such actions involved considerably more than we anticipated. The process of reconceptualizing the goals and nature of the existing unit took us into an extremely sensitive and difficult process. In psychological terms it required the development of the self-conscious to a much greater degree than had previously existed. In looking at the objectives, structure, organizational relationship, activities conducted, research strategies and the like, we began to encounter both personal and structural resistance that needed to be worked through. This process was both demanding and time-consuming. Most of the first year of contract operations was spent in conceptualizing, planning, and organizing the Model Unit and its initial work. Since further deliverables are required in these areas throughout the contract, a significant portion of the second year and, we suspect, third year will also be consumed in resolving our "identity crisis". Even after eighteen months of operation, the resolution is not yet clear to us. Unfortunately, the pressure of other activities in the contract and continuing revisions in scheduling and work requirements has reduced the time available for reflection and analysis of the model. Despite these limitations, the opportunity to reconceptualize the role of evaluators and information in vocational rehabilitation (VR) agency has led to significant alterations in our previous viewpoints as well as served to stimulate staff professional development.

In developing a Model Unit, one of our preliminary concerns was to structure this unit in such a manner that it would have the greatest possible impact on the agency's policy making, planning, and program operations. The RFP required that the unit look particularly at the "direct linkages" it had with the sections responsible for each of these functions within the agency. In attempting to situate the model unit within the agency's organization and to develop a "model" structure, it seemed important to consider the characteristics of the state agency in terms of its organizational structure and hierarchy. The Pennsylvania agency was awarded this contract in the category of a large agency (Section 110 fund over 25 million dollars) and, with its size, the agency certainly possesses the characteristics of a large bureaucracy. The literature on organizational theory and structure (Porter, et al, 1975) suggests that a large organization attempts to maintain its existing state of equilibrium. Although we would argue that the Pennsylvania agency is remarkably fluid and dynamic for its size, it must necessarily possess some degree of this characteristic. Even though change could have been initiated in the organization through revolutionary methods, the existing Program Evaluation Unit as well as the prevailing management philosophy showed a clear preference for an evolutionary style of impact. This logically requires that the sources initiating change be present over some significant degree of time. Therefore, durability was considered to be a key element in establishing this unit and structuring its functions so they would continue after the contract period.

In reviewing the RFP, it was clear that the Federal government intended for the unit to continue after the contract, and in fact required a commitment from the agency that it would do so. Despite this condition to the contract award, as a result of economic changes that have occurred recently, there now appears to be some threat to the continuation of Program Evaluation both at the state and national levels. As Taylor (1979) indicated in his brief review of the development of Program Evaluation, this area is relatively new for rehabilitation agencies. Although the 1966 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act are probably the first precursors of program evaluation in vocational rehabilitation, the 1973 amendments clearly established this function within most agencies. However, problems with the Federal Program Standards, the ambiguity of mandating legislation as well as the defensiveness of many managers across the country has led to continuing resistence to its operation. The latest legislation no longer specifically identifies program evaluation as a required component of VR operations and leaves its place ambiguous. When combined with the austerity of low state budgets at this time and the forecast for even greater cutbacks in the future, the utility and cost-effectiveness of program evaluation within state agencies is being closely scrutinized. Duration or even survivability becomes a germane issue for all Program Evaluation and is especially relevant for a Model Unit. However, this crisis also offers exciting opportunities for the model to clearly prove their utility and to demonstrate an ability to improve operations and make them more efficient in such pivotal times.

At the inception of the contract, Pennsylvania had a Program Evaluation Section which had evolved several years earlier from the statistical and the research units. The section consisted of 8½ full-and part-time professional and clerical staff with an additional four members in regional offices who

served as Case Evaluators for field studies. Both the Evaluation and Management Information Support functions of the agency were conducted within the section, although data processing was handled by a different unit. The section was supported by an IBM 370/158 computer through on-line terminals in all field offices and central office, with the section given high priority for use of these facilities. However, there was not any capability within this system for high level statistical analysis through a package computerized system. In the organizationa hierarchy, Program Evaluation Section was removed two levels from the agency's director.

From the beginning it was felt that the model unit's impact and chances of its work being durable would be substantially increased if it could be closely tied to the existing Program Evaluation Section. By doing this, the existing section's reputation, linkages, technical facilities and other resources could be utilized from the onset without the model unit having to do all the original developmental work. Therefore, the Model Evaluation Unit was made a separate unit within the existing Program Evaluation Section. The dual structure has the advantages of providing centralized information and budget control while giving special emphasis to the contract activities. The dual structure also provides research and field support at an indepth level while maintaining flexibility and the experimental quality of the unit without formally committing it to a particular organizational structure. Under this system the Principal Investigator is responsible for conceptualization, research and technical direction as well as coordinating staff efforts on activities. The Project Manager is also the administrator of the Evaluation Unit and provides administrative and budget direction. The manager also is responsible for coordination between the unit and regular section and the agency.

The RFP required that the unit be situated organizationally so that it is directly responsible and reports directly to the agency director, who is also the project director. This innovative and essential feature has been particularly important in facilitating direct and frequent communication between the Model Unit and the agency's higher organizational levels, and has provided additional authority to the unit's staff during the first year. This has also provided valuable insight into the policy and management decision-making process that would not have been attained otherwise. Additionally, a coordinating committee composed of central office staff and administrators was organized to provide input and to assist in planning and coordinating efforts of the unit across departmental lines. Overall, the placement of the Model Unit within the agency and the development of its linkages with other sections has been designed to both increase its effectiveness and to structurally integrate it into the existing organization in the most conducive manner. Throughout the contract, resources, consultation and training opportunities have been shared between the agency's regular and model evaluation units with the deliberate intention of gradually merging their skills, activities and functions so that units may have a consolidated, single identity by the contract's end.

Several other factors were designed to insure the unit's impact and durability. If a unit is to be accepted within an existing organization it should immediately begin to produce work that is of importance to the agency's recognized concerns and needs. In this instance, several projects were selected that required field studies, and the unit's case service evaluators were immediately put to work on them so that products were available within several months after the contract's initiation. In addition, selecting a unit staff experienced both in evaluation techniques and agency operations was also immensely useful in moving rapidly to an operational capacity. As Patton et al (1978) noted in his discussion of the utilization of evaluation research, the "personal factor" which includes elements such as interest, determination, leadership, and commitment determines whether evaluations have an impact. Such factors were given careful consideration in selecting staff for a model operation and are now clearly recognized as important.

Our experiences to date in constructing a "model" evaluation unit suggest that this process is considerably more difficult and time consuming than had been previously thought. In particular, the need to focus on the design and structural characteristics of the unit, both to increase its durability and to experimentally find the best organizational structure, requires more conceptualization, organizational support, and participant commitment and flexibility than was anticipated. The payoff to both participants and the organization, however, also appears significantly greater than imagined. The long-term issue of durability and continuing impact appears to be a necessary consideration in the original design of a "Model" evaluation unit if it, in fact, is to endure.

REFERENCES

PATTON, M., GRIMES, P., GUTHRIE, K., BRENNAN, N., FRENCH, B., BLYTH, D., "In Search of Impact: An Analysis of the Utilization of Federal Health Research" in COOK, T., Evaluation Studies Review Annual, Sage Publications, Inc., V. 3, 1978.

PORTER, L., LAWLER, E., HACKMAN, J., Behavior in Organization, McGraw Hill, Inc., 1975.

TAYLOR, J., "Establishing Comprehensive Program Evaluation in State Departments of Vocational Rehabilitation" in Program Evaluation in Vocational Rehabilitation Special Edition, Research Utilization Laboratory, V. 3, No. 3, 1979.

U. S. General Accounting Office, Guidelines for Model Evaluation, U.S. GAO January, 1979.

U. S. Office of Human Development Services, Request for Proposal-Comprehensive State VR Program and Policy Systems through Model Evaluation/Management Information Support Units, 1978.

ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM EVALUATION UNIT WITH M.V.R.B.

(MISSISSIPPI VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR THE BLIND)

Economic conditions are forcing both the Federal and state governments to more closely scrutinize the funding of service programs such as VR. With emphasis being placed on cost-effective spending in the delivery of service, it becomes expedient for the VR agencies to take a closer look at themselves and to particularly focus their attention on the role of program evaluation within the context of their organizational structures. For some VR agencies, blind or general, this closer look will reveal the need to re-assess and redefine the scope and duties of their existing program evaluation component; for others, it will mean the creation of a program evaluation component virtually from scratch; for all, it will come to mean the utilization of program evaluation to actualize what program evaluation should accomplish --

a) an objective assessment of what is happening in the total agency be it good, bad or indifferent;

b) determing why the good, bad or indifferent is happening; and,

c) offering to agency management alternative approaches, system creation or modification, new or modified system linkages, and planning strategies to enhance the good; eliminate the bad; and, destroy the indifferent.

The ultimate good a program evaluation component can do for an agency through sound evaluative practices, is to impact management at its various decision-making levels so that the overall agency mission of rehabilitating clients is done efficiently and cost-effectively. It is not unrealistic to project that funding for VR programs will be determined on the basis of efficiency and cost-effectiveness within the next few years. It is therefore timely for VR agencies to move past the counting and reporting of numbers, token program evaluation, to indepth, agency-wide assessments of what is being achieved or not achieved.

Until Mississippi Vocational Rehabilitation for the Blind received RSA Contract 105-78-4005 to create a Model Evaluation Unit within the agency's structure, program evaluation activities constituted but one of the various duties assigned to the Agency's Administrator for Program Support and his one staff person, a Program Development Specialist. While MVRB has a long history of excellence in rehabilitating blind clients, program evaluation was, at best, a numbers game. In submitting the proposal for the aforementioned RSA contract, agency management acknowledged that while it recognized the need for structured, indepth program evaluation, the agency simply lacked funds for establishing a component of qualified persons to be solely concerned with evaluation activities.

The purpose of this article is not only to call VR administrators' attention to the fact that program evaluation should be handled by a component or unit solely, or at least primarily, concerned with evaluation activities, it is also to share with other blind and general VR agencies how MVRB got its unit on its feet and running once funds were made available. Hopefully, our experiences will assist VR agencies in upgrading their existing program evaluation components; assist in the establishment of units where none exist; and, encourage all VR agencies to make program evaluation meaningful enough to reap maximum benefits from the time and effort spent.

PRIORITY NUMBER ONE

In order for evaluation as a practice to produce anything worthwhile, and in order for a program evaluation unit to impact an agency's operation, agency management from top-line to second-third-/and fourth-line administrators or supervisors must realize that they have a vested interest in the evaluation process. Evaluation is a term that either evokes total apathy or sudden panic. It has somehow come to connote "blame" as opposed to the objective reporting of factual information. This obvious problem with semantics may well explain why token evaluation has been so rampant in VR agencies. Evaluation is nothing more than objective assessment of an activity. If an activity has been well planned and conducted according to plan, an evaluation of it can only reveal that which happened as a result of conducting the activity. Assessment of the activity as a phase of the evaluative process can only reveal whether or not the activity helped reach a planned goal. In essence, evaluation does not take place for the sake of finding fault or placing blame; is should take place for the sake of effectiveness and efficiency in meeting goals. The management of an agency must then clearly have a vested interest in the evaluation process which must include (1) a commitment to contribute to the process by sound planning which lends itself to sound evaluation; (2) a commitment to test, if applicable, evaluation outcomes; and, (3) a commitment to utilize evaluation outcomes to increase individual, component, and agency goal attainment.

LOGISTICS OF GETTING THE MVRB UNIT STARTED

As is the case with MVRB, it may ironically turn out that funding will come to be regarded as one of the least of problems in establishing a program evaluation unit.

Dr. John Gehi, Director of Institutional Research at Atlanta's Spelman College, sent our MEU a copy of John Gall's book, in which Gall states that "People In Systems Do Not Do What The System Says They Are Doing," and further notes that Murphy's Law, "If anything can go wrong, it will," is still valid. While it can be reasonably concluded that Gall did not have the logistics of establishing the Mississippi MEU in mind when he authored SYSTEMANTICS, it must be conceded that establishing the Mississippi MEU could have served as a model for his book.

Because our fundings was 100% federal money for an experimental project of three-years duration, some unique problems had to be solved in order to hire staff and expend funds. The first problem with hiring staff had to do with MVRB meeting the requirements of the State Classification Commission. This Commission designates the number of job slots and job position titles a state agency can have. Additionally, this Commission determines the requirements a person must meet to be hired in a specific job position. Once a state agency's job slots and position titles are set, it is a rather lengthy process involving both the state agency and the Commission to add staff to the agency's list and to add new titles.

Since the MEU had to initiate and complete its work in accord with the mandates of the RSA contract, the least time consuming solution to the problem or hiring staff was to simply designate, on paper, the MEU as a state agency within a state agency. This sounds peculiar and does require further explanation (Gall was right!). As a state agency, the MEU could get approval of job slots much faster than approval could be secured for MVRB to add to its existing slot allocation. Thus, the creation of the MEU as a state agency within MVRB allowed it to meet its contract mandates and at the same time satisfy the State Classification Commission's requirements that (1) at the end of the three-year period the state agency status of the MEU would cease along with Federal funding supporting it; (2) all staff hired by the MEU would be hired in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Classification Commission requirements for similarly existing job position titles. In the RSA contract and system, the Unit's Technical Writer is called a Technical Writer; however, in the Classification Commission's system, the Technical Writer is called a Public Information/Relations Writer II.

The matter of hiring staff involved yet another hurdle; that of getting approval to expend funds provided by the contract. Approval for state agencies to expend funds and the procedure by which funds can be expended are regulated by the State Budget Commission. Since the MEU's Federal funds were subjected to state regulation, approval from the Budget Commission was needed for such things as purchasing, leasing, renting of equipment, salaries, and for all purchases requiring competitive bidding.

The Capitol Commission of the State of Mississippi regulates and approves the square footage of physical space that can be used by state agencies. This square footage for the MEU was determined on the basis of the number of employees to be physically housed. The MEU's Principal Investigator had to first locate suitable office space based on Capital Commission requirements and then appear before the Capital Commission to explain (1) why MVRB needed additional space to house the MEU: (2) how the additional space would be paid for; (3) what the MEU was designed to accomplish; (4) where the proposed space was located; (5) how long the MEU would need the space, and so forth. Once approval was given by the Capitol Commission, the MEU moved into its offices.

It is likely that most VR agencies have similar commissions or boards that regulate employment, housing, and budgetary matters. Therefore, the approval or lack of approval from such boards and commissions has a great bearing on getting a program evaluation component started. Based on our experiences, we would recommend that a VR agency do the following prior to

expecting the program evaluation to begin functioning:

1) Make a simple listing of all board and/or commissions whose approval will be required to establish the program evaluation component and use the listing as a checklist to make sure that all needed sanctions are secured:

2) If it appears that the sources of funding or some other exogenous factors may hinder implementation of the component, make a list of alternatives solutions to submit to regulating boards and/or commissions;

3) If funding for the program evaluation unit is to be a included in the agency's annual budget, prepare such justification as may be necessary to support the request for additional funds, transfer of funds, etc.

THE CRUCIAL MATTER OF STAFFING THE UNIT

The staff for a program evaluation unit will depend on (1) what the agency expects the unit to accomplish, (2) the size of the agency, and (3) funds available for hiring evaluation staff. The MVRB MEU consists of four staff person: a Principal Investigator who directs all unit activities and has final determination of unit projects; a Systems Analyst who is responsible for the development and modification fo agency systems, for the design of and modification of agency systems, for data interpretation and for the design of data collection instruments; a Technical Writer who is responsible for formatting and writing all MEU reports and/or documents and for assisting in evaluation activities conducted by the MEU's clerical, secretarial, and general office management needs. The MEU serves an agency that has 109 job position slots. When the MEU contract expires, its work will be phased into the MVRB Program Support Unit which will assume full responsibility for all agency evaluation activities.

One valid method for determing what type of staff will be needed for an evaluation unit is to simply look at what is required of the agency and use those requirements to determine what kind of staff persons would be most appropriate. The MVRB unit, in the process of developing a Basic Management Paradigm for the agency, developed a matrix of twenty (20) compliance activities for which MVRB is responsible during the course of a fiscal year. These compliance activities run the gamut from routine reporting to continued studies to researching, writing, and maintaining on file certain reports which are open to public scrutiny. Using such a matrix, an agency could well staff its program evaluation unit on the basis of what type of people are needed to insure agency complaince in various areas. Since compliance activities <u>should</u> be one of the major areas evaluated annually, a program evaluation <u>unit</u> could assist agency management in developing a flagging system to insure that compliance activities are taken care of on a timely basis.

In developing a new program evaluation unit and in upgrading exisiting units, VR agencies should (1) determine, in writing, what they are responsbile for internally and externally, (2) plan activities that lend themselves to evaluation, and (3) select staff who will not only conduct evaluation activities to detemine if item #1 is happening, but who can also contribute to the agency's planning of activities, initiation of activities, and revision of modification of agency activities. At a minimum, the Mississippi MEU recommend that a program evaluation unit consist of:

1) an administrator thoroughly familiar with the agency's operations, external requirements (federal and state) placed on the agency, and the state-of-the-art in evaluation;

2) a systems analyst capable of developing or modifying agency systems, capable of determining methods of using data processing within the agency, and capable of contributing to other facets of the evaluation unit's duties (i.e. writing, designing data collection instruments;

3) a writer capable of preparing evaluation outcomes so that they are understood by agency staff, capable of assisting in the preparation of agency training and/or operative manuals, and capable of assisting in and contributing to the other facets of the program evaluation unit's duties;

4) a researcher/statistician capable of manipulating statistical data as needed in reports, documents, etc., capable of researching general subjects for information needed by agency component and management and capable of contributing to other duties of the program evaluation unit; and

5) a secretary, who in addition to handling the unit's secretarial needs, can also contribute to the unit's functions through such skills as establishing and managing a unit library, establishing and managing a central file for unit products, agency reports for public use, etc.

While each staff person in the Mississippi MEU has specific duties to perform, each person is also involved in the planning, researching, and reporting activities of the unit. For example, in addition to his administrative duties, the Principal Investigator also does report writing and editing, research, oral presentations of evaluation outcomes, and statistical data analyses to name a few. The MEU Secretary, in addition to her normal duties, is currently compiling data being collected in a phase of the pretest of the proposed Standards developed by Berkeley Planning Associates, Inc. Thus, a good program evaluation team should be a multi-skilled group of persons capable of performing beyond assigned duties.

INTRODUCING THE PROGRAM EVALUATION UNIT TO THE AGENCY

Earlier in this article it was noted that VR agency administrators must come to see that they have a vested interest in program evaluation in order for evaluation outcomes to be of any significance. All agency staff must likewise come to see evaluation of their individual and team efforts as a

step toward improving overall agency performance, not just performance in their own private sectors. Very cognizant of the common connotations of the term "evaluation", the MEU tried to get off to a good start by explaining its role to all MVRB staff. This was done through using established vehicles of communication in the agency (i.e. Regional Directors Meetings, Agency Newsletter) to convey in general terms how evaluation functions in an agency and how individuals and components could use the services of the MEU to better plan and meet individual, component, and overall agency goals. Additionally, the MEU visited all facilities which provide services to MVRB clients, participated in joint projects with the MVRB Program Support Unit, called on individual agency staff persons to informally discuss their needs and how the MEU could assist, and began publication of a single-sheet monthly Xeroxed newsletter to keep all agency staff abreast of what the MEU was doing and planning to do.

Such methods of "getting to know each other" paved the way for further MEU and MVRB staff communication. Thus, the MEU was justifiably pleased when District Office responded positively to participation in data collection for the BPA proposed Standards. Even though participation by the District Offices meant an increased work load, no unwillingness to participate was exhibited. This action, we feel, underscores the value of properly introducing evaluaton as a concept and the evaluation unit to an agency.

Since much of the evaluation that takes place in VR agencies is directed at the counselor-level, the MEU immediately looked for a means of establishing and maintaining communications with this level. Beyond informal interviews and including a "book review" section which reflects the state-of-the-art in counseling in our monthly newsletter, the MEU also initiated preparation of monthly graphs to illustrate to counselors exactly where they were in terms of reaching numerical goals set for rehabilitation of clients. Each counselor received his/her individual "Time and Milestone Chart" which was not distributed to other agency staff. The counselors supervisors received a similar chart reflecting the district's progress and the Director of Field Services received a copy of the district chart and a statewide cumulative chart. These charts were a clear statement from the MEU to counselors that their progress, or lack of progress, toward a monthly goal was information charted exclusively for their constructive use and information which was being judiciously handled by the MEU. Of course, a counselors progress/lack of progress toward a numerical goal was not a secret undiscoverable by the supervisors, but the MEU opted to handle the charts it produced for counselors (who are often "blamed" for an agency "lack" of success) in a manner to inspire confidence and hopefully to eliminate the negativism associated with evaluation products.

Since the methods of introducing the MEU to MVRB staff were carefully thought out and have thus far served a good purpose, we suggest that other VR agencies utilize any of them that they deem workable in their agencies.

WHAT DOES THE PROGRAM EVALUATION UNIT DO?

The Mississippi MEU has a number of activities it must perform as mandated by the RSA contract funding it. These same activities are also required of the other five VR agencies which received contracts. In addition

to fulfilling contract mandates, the Mississippi MEU has conducted routine and special evaluation projects for MVRB. A partial listing of these activities include:

1) An analysis and subsequent revision of the MVRB form and procedure used in conducting the annual Review of Clients in Extended Employment;

2) An analysis of all forms (state and federal) used by MVRB with subsequent recommendations to agency management based on findings;

3) Development of a procedure for agency response to external requests for information (special reporting);

4) Preparation of the agency's annual Quality Control/Case Review Report in conjunction with the MVRB Program Support Unit;

5) Development of the facility reporting forms used in the Facilities Utilization Reporting System developed by the agency and RSA personnel based in Atlanta;

6) Development of the proposal and securing of partial funding for MVRB data processing equipment;

7) Construction of an Employer Assessment Questionnaire to be used to collect follow-up data on MVRB clients placed into the competitive labor force by MVRB Affirmative Action Specialists; and,

8) Development of a Basic Management Paradigm which is not yet complete but has included (1) an analysis of MVRB staff positions, and (2) the design of a matrix of MVRB compliance activities.

Clearly, this listing of MEU activities reflects that program evaluation at MVRB is responsive to specifically identified needs and encompasses the total agency.

One method a VR agency might use to determine what program evaluation should address is to develop and prioritize a compliance matrix so that the unit can proceed step by step. Another approach that would be workable is for an agency to determine its areas of strengths and weaknesses and let the program evaluation unit begin by addressing these areas. Still another method is to let a program evaluation unit begin by addressing one major facet of the agency (i.e. a particular component, the decision-making process, the process by which agency goals are formulated).

Evaluation is not, nor should it be considered, a panacea for all of an agency's ills. Yet, by determining a workable approach, a program evaluation unit can key in on specific ills and work its way around to offering remedies for same. Eventually, the total agency can be addressed.

IS A PROGRAM EVALUATION UNIT WORTH THE HASSLE?

Perhaps at the end of our three-year contract, we can provide a profound and philosophical answer to this question. As things stand now, our best answer is a simple "yes", establishing or upgrading a program evaluation unit is well worth the hassle. The need for sound evaluation in VR is not going to diminish, it is rapidly becoming required. The uses of program evaluation outcomes and the areas which program evaluation can address are limited only by how program evaluation is conceived by agency management. Sound program evaluation conducted in an agency genuinely concerned with efficiently and effectively delivering services to clients will yield valid data for decision-making and thereby impact the agency's mission. Conversely, token evaluation will yield token results. Establishing or upgrading the program evaluation unit in VR is well worth the hassle.

MANAGING REQUESTS FOR EVALUATION INFORMATION

LAURILEE B. HATCHER
STATE OF OREGON DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Evaluation information is needed for decision-making at every level of the organization. As administrators, planners, program managers and counselors make decisions about resources allocation, accountability, policy formulation, policy evaluation or improving programs, they need evaluation information. Even in a small agency this need can soon exceed the capacity of program evaluation staff to provide information. When such a need becomes excessive, the information retrieval process can become very frustrating; without a structured, rational process to manage requests for information the system may become fraught with inefficiency, missed schedules, duplication of work and unusable products. The following pages describe how the Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Division uses a service request process to manage information resources.

Information resources are managed jointly by the Automated Data Processing (ADP) Unit and the Program Evaluation and Statistics (PE&S) Unit, Oregon's model evaluation unit. These are two separate administrative units with the managers of both units responsible to the Deputy Administrator. The necessary link between the two units to permit PE&S to manage information is achieved through the service request process and a PE&S research analyst assigned as liaison.

The ADP Unit consists of a unit manager, five systems analysts and programmers, and three data entry and production staff. They have a remote job entry facility which permits submitting jobs to a computer housed several miles away in the Department of Human Resources computer center. The data processing staff has responsibility for maintaining and refining a number of systems, including the Client Information Teleprocessing System (CITPS), the accounting system, payroll and accounting for the state-operated facility, and case files and accounting systems for the Disability Determination unit. In addition to these systems, the ADP Unit maintains and refines routine management information reports and responds to special requests for information. All special requests for information from existing files, requests to add or delete data elements in an automated file, requests to create or discontinue an automated file, and requests to create, discontinue, or modify a routine management information report are documented as service requests in the PE&S Unit.

The PE&S Unit consists of the unit manager, a management analyst, three research analysts and a clerical specialist. This unit has responsibility for forms management, purchasing of printing and copying services, maintenance of the agency policy and procedure manual, special research projects, program evaluation and follow-up studies, Federal and state reports, coordination of the service request process, and information retrieval. Members of the unit are skilled in the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Easytrieve, a basic retrieval language, and use these skills to meet special information needs. The various members of the unit have been assigned as specialists in the different activities and serve as liaison with various management units. This liaison assignment permits development of rapport with

program managers as well as development of expertise in specialized subject areas. This facilitates analysis of problems and the proposed solutions. When any agency staff has a need for information, they discuss their need with a PE&S Unit member to begin the service request process.

When PE&S analysts are confronted with information needs, they conduct analyses of the needs. In consultation with the requester, the PES-300, ADP/PE&S Service Request Form, is completed. (See Attachment 1.) In this initial review, the analysts must consider whether the need has been stated clearly. If it has not, they must continue the discussion until it has been. The analysts must seek to identify what data may meet this information need. If the data are not available, they must consider the possibility of adding new data elements to the system to provide for future needs. If the data are available, they must consider the various alternatives of locating it in existing reports, using PE&S staff to retrieve it from computer files, or requesting ADP services. If it is contained in existing reports, they must consider the other workload and priorities of the unit to determine whether to direct the requester to the appropriate files or do it for him. If the PE&S analyst is unsure of the availability of the information or of the feasibility of ADP completing the requests, the PE&S/ADP liaison analyst is consulted.

When staff initiate requests, they must specify priority. We use a simple priority schedule consisting of four rankings. A ranking of four means the information is useful, but not essential to the requester; a ranking of three means the information is essential to the user, as it results in loss of effectiveness or efficiency if not provided by the date needed; a ranking of two means the information is essential for the accomplishment of major agency objectives and, therefore, must be provided by the date specified; and a priority of one means the information is considered so critical that the agency administrator or his deputy has indicated other work must be set aside as needed to meet the specified due date. When the requester specifies a priority, the PE&S analyst assures that the priority is consistent with the intended use as specified in the request.

In the analysis of the requests, the PE&S analysts must assure the desired results are clearly specified. If the requester is representing a third party (another state agency)), the intended user may review the specifications of content and format. The PE&S analysts will attempt to estimate the volume of output to help the requester plan for the use. For example, if someone requests information about reason for closure and diagnosed disability for closures for the last three years for each local office, the PE&S analyst may point out that this could result in tables containing over 200,000 values. When presented with this analysis, the requester may consider another format or some grouping structure to make the output more usable. Other questions considered in this analysis are presented in Attachment 2.

Upon completion of the analysis of what needs to be done, the PE&S analysts must recommend to the Unit Manager how it should be done. They indicate whether it might best be referred back to the requester, completed by PE&S staff, or routed to ADP. Their recommendations and the completed service request form are passed on to the PE&S Unit Manager for authorization.

If the request cannot be completed because data are not available or if the request is so complex that the cost justification is not evident, the PE&S Unit Manager will refer the request back to the requester. If the information is available in the agency library, or if some other staff member has the information, the PE&S Unit Manager will decide, based on the unit's current workload and priorities, whether to collect the information or refer the requester to it. If a computer program is required, it may be assigned to a PE&S analyst or routed to ADP.

When the PE&S Unit Manager authorized a service request or denies it, it is logged into the PE&S service request log (see Attachment 3). The original is given to the assigned PE&S analyst or to the ADP liaison analyst and the copy is filed in a PE&S file for outstanding requests.

When the ADP liaison delivers the request to ADP, basic information about it is entered into an automated service request log maintained by ADP (see Attachment 4). The ADP Unit Manager reviews the request, consulting with his staff as necessary. If they determine the request cannot be completed by the date specified, they notify the requester and project a possible completion date. The requester may then accept the projected date or negotiate for a higher priority to receive it sooner.

While requests are being worked on, both PE&S and ADP have a tracking system. The PE&S log contains records of all ADP and PE&S requests, while the ADP log contains records only of ADP requests. An agency ADP user committee was established to provide guidance in prioritizing and scheduling work. Whenever problems arise and the ADP Unit Manager finds it impossible to meet all deadlines or reach compromise on rescheduling, the committee may be called together to review the workload. The ADP log of outstanding requests can serve as a basis for discussion and the renegotiated schedules can be used to update the log.

When an ADP service request is completed, the product is delivered to the requester who initials the request form to acknowledge receipt. A copy of this initialed form is routed to PE&S. The ADP documentation of the request and copies of the program are filed with the original request form in ADP so they can be rerun if needed. Both PE&S and ADP update their request logs. In the case of a PE&S completed request, the process is the same except that ADP does not receive a copy.

The priority ranking process has proven to be valuable in managing the workload in ADP. Very few priority "1" requests have been necessary, as work can be scheduled to meet due dates. Requesters are encouraged to anticipate their needs and allow at least two weeks whenever possible. The ADP Unit Manager receives reports regularly to monitor which requests are done, which are overdue, which are due soon, and what portion were completed by their due dates. Probably the biggest problem with this priority scheme has been an inclination on the part of some users to assign higher priorities than warranted by their need. This misuse can be controlled, however, by the PE&S or ADP Manager challenging the requester based on the intended use that was specified and by regular meetings of the ADP users' committee.

A number of observations can readily be made about the benefits of this service request process in the effort to manage information. The service request form itself has been structured to lead the requesters through documentation which can readily be converted to computer program code. As people make requests, they become more accustomed to the structure and learn to express their information needs more specifically. As they participate in the analysis process, they become more aware of the potential benefits of the system as well as its weaknesses so they are better able to offer suggestions for the development of the system. Outgrowths of this increased awareness include suggestions made to add elements to the client file and requests by program managers for training in Easytrieve programming.

In summary, the Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation Division's service request process is a manageable approach to information retrieval. The link between the Program Evaluation and Statistics Unit and the Automated Data Processing Unit provides for a sharing of responsibility for meeting information needs. As program managers and planners specify their information needs and assist in the evaluation of data resources available, they become more conscious of the process required to maintain an adequate data base. Both content of the data base and quality control exercised in it become concerns of the users as well as the data processors. This user-oriented data base management increases the likelihood that information will be available and usable when it is needed.

ATTACHMENT 1

Department of Human Resources
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION DIVISION

PE&S/ADP SERVICE REQUEST

Title _____ Priority 1 2 3 4 #_____

Requester _____ Date Requested _____

Need by (Date) _____ How often? Once ____ Other ____

Describe Project Needed: _____

_____

_____

_____

Data Files: ____ Client ____ Cost (include DDO ____) ____ DDO Master
____ Manual files ____ Other _____

Date Period: From _____ to _____

Deliver Product to _____

How will results be used? _____

_____

Where will results be filed? _____

_____

Request Type:
____ Change file date
____ Change to program permanent
____ Change to program temporary
____ Rerun, update program
____ New program
____ Library retrieval
____ Other _____

Specifications Descriptions:

Selection Criteria _____

_____

Printout Sequence _____

_____

Elements/Format _____

_____

Totals, Counts _____

_____

_____

PE&S Authorization _____ Assigned to _____

Delivered to ADP _____ Logged out _____

_____

ADP Acct # _____ Assigned Date _____

Proj. Leader _____ Initials Compl. _____ ACD _____

Requester initials acknowledging delivery/completion _____

Comments _____

_____

ATTACHMENT 2

GUIDELINES TO REVIEW AN ADP REQUEST

If the request does require ADP services, consider the type of ADP request. Each of the following 10 types raises special questions.

1) Change computer file constants such as goals, field budgets, counselor names, or service codes.
   a) Has the change(s) been authorized by the appropriate person?
   b) Should anyone else be notified?
   c) What turnaround evidence of change is needed?

2) Run an existing program with a modification such as change in date period or population as anticipated in the original request to create the program.
   a) Is the change clearly identified?
   b) Is the data to be comparable to any other data?

3) Modify an existing program by changing something not anticipated in the original request, such as a change in sort order or added elements.
   a) Is the change clearly identified?
   b) Is the data to be comparable to any other data?

4) Prepare a new program to retrieve specified elemetns in a requested format (not anticipated to become a routine report).
   a) Which elements are wanted? Clearly defined?
   b) Is format specified? Is format flexible?
   c) Could an existing report with modifications provide this data?
   d) Do we want flexibility to rerun with specific changes?

5) Program a new report to become routine.
   a) Which elements are needed? Clearly defined?
   b) Is format specified?
   c) What will distribution schedule be?
   d) Is it to be comparable to other data?
   e) Will someone document for users? Who? When?
   f) Will user training be required? Why? When?

6) Add new file element(s) through additional or changed input and storage processes.
   a) What input process has been established?
   b) Have all parties involved in input been consulted?
   c) Are any forms or instructions changes necessary? Training?
   d) Is there a clear documented definition of the element?
   e) Does this element make some other element unnecessary?
   f) Will we try to retroactively collect it for other records?

7) Delete an existing file element.
   a) What is it being used for?
   b) Have all users been consulted?
   c) What other reports/systems may be affected?

d) Has the input vehicle been eliminated?
e) Should the file retain what it has?

8) Change an existing internal system of processing data.
a) What are the current uses?
b) Have all users been consulted?
c) Is the change clearly defined?
d) Is the justification documented?
e) What problems could it create in making data more comparable or less comparable to other data?

9) Establish a new internal system of processing data.
a) Could a modification to existing systems suffice?
b) Is the process clearly defined?
c) Is the justification documented?
d) Have potential users all been consulted?
e) Will the results overlap with others?

10) Combination of any of the above.

ATTACHMENT 3

PE&S SERVICE REQUEST LOG

NO.	TITLE	USER	REQ DATE	PRIORITY	DUE DATE	ASSIGNED	COMPLE
666	Target Monitor Names	Laurilee	01/12/75	3	01/05/80	X/LH	
1177	Vendor File On-Line DDO	Shari	06/05/78		11/02/79	X	
1202	Special Service Codes					RW	
1262	Status 20 Clients	Clarence	10/24/78	3	10/31/78	RW	
1266	Admin Review Data	Mike W.	11/01/78	2	01/01/79	X/LH	02/01/
1320	WCD Billing Report	Tim	03/08/79	2	07/31/79	X/LH	04/10/
1331	ISO	Betty N.	03/01/79	2	09/01/80	LH	
1347	Vendor File	Sue T.	05/08/79	2	10/26/79	X/LH	
1359	Placemt Svc Vendor FY79	Jack	05/30/79	3	06/30/79	RW	05/30/
1365	AFS Shelt Empl Subsidy	John S.	05/15/79	2	07/20/79	X/LH	
1373	SSDI Denied Pre-Plan $	Elsie	07/17/79	2	10/20/79	X/LH	
1380	Revise SSA 853	Elsie	07/27/79	2	10/15/79	X/LH	12/07/
1384	WCD Data - History	John J.	08/06/79	2	08/12/79	X/LH	
1409	WCD Study	Carl	06/28/79			LH	
1410	Revised R-13	RSA	07/06/79	2	12/01/79	LH	
1413	OJT Study	Irene	09/05/79	2	12/15/79	X/LH	04/04/8
1424	Cost Edit Change	Ken/Sue T.	09/20/79	2	01/22/80	X/LH	C01/01/8
1440	Service Code Change	Sue T.	09/27/79	2	10/02/79	X/LH	
1441	SSI/DI 1407 Update	Ken/Elsie	10/02/79	2	10/12/79	X/LH	
1445	Facility Rpt Changes	Art	10/02/79	2	01/20/80	X/LH	04/04/8
1449	1407's	Ken	10/04/79	1	10/12/79	X/LH	
1455	1407's - Closed Records	Elsie	10/15/79	3	11/16/79	X/LH	
1459	Alaska Visit	Schlicting	10/09/79			LH	
1462	Recognized Svc Update	John D.	10/24/79	2	01/01/80	X/LH	
1466	Leave Utilization	Sue D.	01/23/80	2	04/01/80	X	04/15/8
1469	DDO Processing Time	Tim	11/01/79	3	01/10/80	X/RM	02/22/8
1472	Reg 1026 Repeat	Dick D.	11/23/79	2	11/30/79	X/LH	
1473	Modify Examiner Tables	Dick D.	10/04/79	2	12/31/79	X/LH	
1474	Reg Brkdwn for Flowshts	Dick D.	10/04/79	2	12/31/79	X/LH	
1475	Reg Brkdwn DVRD1026	Dick D.	10/04/79	2	01/18/80	X/LH	
1476	Cleanup Exam 74 on 1026	Dick D.	10/04/79	3	02/08/80	X/LH	
1477	List Pending Over 60	Dick D.	11/09/79	3	12/31/79	X/LH	

THIS PE&S SERVICE REQUEST LOG IS MAINTAINED IN THE PE&S UNIT. THOSE REQUESTS ASSIGNED TO ADP ARE INDICATED BY AN "X" IN THE "ASSIGNED" COLUMN. THE INITIALS OF THE PE&S RESEARCH ANALYST ASSIGNED TO THE REQUEST ARE ALSO NOTED.

ATTACHMENT 4

DVREQUST VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION DIVISION OUTSTANDING REQUESTS BY PRIORITY
4/14/80

TITLE	SERV RQST NO	ASSIGN TO	PRIOR	DATE RECEIVED	DATE ASSIGNED	ORIGINAL DATE NEEDED	COMPLETION AGREED DATE	USER	ACCT NO
GROUP REQ1026 BY REGION	1475	5B	2	10/04/79	10/04/79	01/18/80	01/25/80	DDO	0300
TRNG NEEDS RPT 2	1557	RB	2	01/16/80	01/16/80	01/31/80	RESCDL	TRNG	0407
ADP EDIT CHANGE/ REPLACES 1424	1560	MM	2	01/22/80	01/22/80	02/28/80	02/28/80	FISCAL	0402
CDI ANALYSIS	1518	SB	2	02/12/80	02/12/80	03/15/80		DDO	0300
SAMPLE EE AND ELIG	1550	RR	2	01/18/80	03068	04/14/80		PE&S	0404
PROJECT SUPPLEMENTS	1552	RR	2	01/11/80	03/27/80	04/14/80	03/14/80	PE&S	0404
CLOSURE-FOLLOWUP SAMPLES	1549	SB	2	01/11/80	01/16/80	04/15/80	02/01/80	PE&S	0404
BUDGET MODEL	1605	RR	2	03/10/80	03/28/80	04/18/80		PE&S	0404
CITPS ERROR MSG CHANGE	1622	RR	2	04/08/80	04/09/80	04/25/80			0504
SPECIAL R-300	1551	SB	2	01/11/80	01/16/80	04/30/80		PE&S	0404
CITPS POST EMPLOYMENT	C004	DK	2		10/30/79	05/01/80		ONLINE	0500
CITPS SSI/DI UPDATE	C001	SB	2		08/15/79	06/01/80		ONLINE	0500
DEVELOP TRNG RECORDS SYS-PATTS	1558	SB	2	01/31/80	04/08/80	07/30/80		TRNG	0407
VENDOR MASTER FILE ON-LINE SYS	1177		3	06/07/78	06/08/78	11/02/79		FISCAL	0402
LIST PENDING OVER 60 DAYS	1477	SB	3	11/09/79	11/09/79	12/31/79		DDO	0300
TARGET MONITOR NAMES	666		3	01/12/76		01/05/80		PRGMGR	0410
EXAMINER 74 PROBLEM ON 1026	1476	SB	3	10/04/79	10/04/79	02/08/80		DDO	0300
CITPS CHANGE SPECIAL DEAF	1593	RR	3	02/20/80	04/09/80	03/28/80	04/28/80	PRGMGR	0410
I&E GRANT FY 9-30-77	924	MM	5	03/30/77	03/23/78	NS		FISCAL	0402
FEDERAL YEAR END 9/76	926	MM	5	03/23/77	03/23/77	NS		FISCAL	0402
FEDERAL YEAR END 9-30-77	1102	MM	5	02/23/78	02/23/78	NS		FISCAL	0402
RECOGNIZED SERVICE UPDATE	1462	SB	5	10/24/79		01/01/80		PERS	0406

AS OF 04/14/80 THERE WERE 22 OUTSTANDING REQUESTS

BOOK REVIEW

EVALUATION: PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

JOSEPH S. WHOLEY, THE URBAN INSTITUTE

Reviewed by
Robert D. Struthers, Ph.D., Michigan Department of Education,
Bureau of Rehabilitation

The demand for better evaluation continues to grow, and books on the subject are proliferating. RSA's model program evluation project has allowed the Michigan unit to examine more literature on the subject than it had available in the past. Much of what we see restates evaluation concepts, discusses general issues such as the failure of managers to utilize evaluative information, presents highly technical discussions of evaluation research, or provides case examples from subjects quite different from rehabilitation. Evaluation: Promise and Performance falls somewhat in the last category but, nonetheless, has a number of qualities that we felt were impressive.

The evaluation strategy presented in the book has been developed by the Urban Institute program evaluation staff in their work with federal and local agencies during the past decade. Much of the text consists of examples from Urban Institute work. The author, Joseph S. Wholey, has worked at both the Urban Institute and within the Federal government and is currently employed in program evaluation in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The book, therefore, has credibility because it's based on work by practicing evaluators in the Federal government, and because it represents recent experiences. In addition, it deals with a problem that seems all too familiar; i.e., how to produce useful evaluation information in an efficient and practical manner when dealing with complex organizations and with limited evaluation resources.

Although there has been constant growth in demand for program evaluation since the late 1960's, evaluative efforts have often seemed to miss the mark. On one hand there has appeared to be a simplistic belief that almost any quantitative report would have significant evaluative meaning. Usually, such has not been the case. Instead, "evaluation" has often added new reporting burdens, but has provided data with little meaning for decision makers. At the other extreme, there has been a feeling that "real evaluation" cannot be done unless the rigor of evaluation research, complete with control groups, can be imposed.

Wholey's book does not tell how to achieve comprehensive evaluation of complex agencies with a staff of one or two people, but the book illustrates both by its strategy (moving from evaluability assessment to intensive evaluation) and by its examples, how evaluated can be conducted to be useful in organizations such as a rehabilitation agency. Instead of proceeding from a theoretical definition of evaluation, Wholey launches immediately

into what evaluators do with program managers when a problem is presented, and shows how the evaluator can perform a service to managers before a decision is made to launch into more intensive evaluation.

As stated in the summary of the book, Evaluation: Promise and Performance "shows how evaluators can help government managers and policy makers to clarify the intent of government programs and to improve program efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness. The book presents a strategy through which evaluators can determine what information is likely to be used and purchase sequential increments of timely, useful information on program promise and performance." (p. xiii)

The four steps described are: (1) evaluability assessment; (2) feedback evaluation; (3) performance monitoring; and (4) intensive evaluation. Evaluability assessment explores the expectations and information needs of policy makers and program managers and assesses the extent to which evaluation information is likely to be used by program management. The products of evaluability assessment are: (1) a set of agreed-on program objectives on which the program can realistically be held accountable; and (2) a set of evaluation/management options which represent ways in which management can change program activities, objectives, or uses of information in ways likely to improve program performance.

After the results of the evaluability assessment are completed, rapid feed-back evaluation summarized readily-obtainable information on program performance in terms of those objectives. During this phase the evaluator estimates the cost and value of additional information and presents designs for one or more full-scale evaluations. Step 3 is performance monitoring which measures program performance in terms of the agreed-on objectives and compares program performance with prior or expected performance. In the final step, intensive evaluation, comparison or control groups are used to estimate the extent to which program results were caused by program activities. Each component in this "sequential purchase of information" is described with examples, a description of important steps, and a discussion of the problems that occur for evaluators.

The book os 227 pages (softcover) in double-space typed format. The style is parsimonious and conveys the information with little embellishment. The book is liberally illustrated with flow diagrams and inserted examples. For example, Table I-1 lists "Questions that evaluators typically face," including such items as "How do I define the purpose of this evaluation project?", "How do I determine when evaluation is not possible?", and "How can the evaluation process be structured so that the results are fed into the decision process and used?" Table II-5 shows a "Typical evaluability assessment site visit schedule," including the activities scheduled from 9:00 a.m. of the first day to 4:00 p.m. of the second. Table II-6 gives a guide for interviews with local project staff. The appendix addresses such issues as "Keyzsteps in planning a sample survey," and "Selection of sample design and sample size."

Although the book is written in a highly readable style, it is not read easily from beginning to end simply because, as with most evaluation issues, the detail and content build up quite rapidly. It requires effort by the reader to go through the examples provided and elicit the meaning and possible application to another setting such as rehabilitation. No space is spent on discussing comparative definitions or relating the discussion to theoretical models. The book is based instead on distillations from the work done by the Urban Institute, and those sources are quoted extensively. The bibliography extends to seven pages and includes a wide range of sources not usually reviewed by program evaluators in rehabilitation.

Evaluation: Promise and Performance is probably not the first book one would want to read on evaluation. It would appear to be of most interest to evaluators who have already tried to conduct evaluation in an agency setting. It should help those who are seeking a systematic approach in trying to deal with problems that seem to far exeed their available evaluation resources, and who have already accepted the fact that there is a great amount of tedious detailed study required to understand and untangle the complexities of modern bureaucratic institutions. Our unit found it to be a refreshing, realistic, and powerful approach that we think will assist us to develop our skills as evaluators.

The book is available from the publication office of the Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, for $7.50.

BOOK REVIEW

THE PROFESSION AND PRACTICE OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

SCARVIA B. ANDERSON & SAMUEL BALL

Reviewed by
W.H. Brownfield, Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services

A program evaluation primer! As the flysheet notes, the book is a precise and practical guide to program evaluation, and offers as well, discussions of the numerous issues facing program evaluation as an expanding profession. My reading of the book led me to agree that it is, indeed, a practice-oriented approach focusing on day-to-day evaluation issues rather than dealing with the theoretical debates.

Following a discussion of issues in the emerging profession of PE, the book is divided into three sections which address (1) evaluation practices, (2) ethics and values in evaluation and (3) the future of program evaluation. Certainly this is not a specific "how to" evaluation text, nor does it provide a comprehensive discussion of research designs or statistical techniques useful in PE. On the other hand, it is almost "required reading" for any new staff member joining a program evaluation unit or section. It seems particularly suited to new evaluators in the vocational rehabilitation field or other VR staff interested in evaluation. Many of these persons come to the staff assignment with much programmatic data related to the rehabilitation process but with little understanding of evaluation as either a practice or a profession.

This 242-page book was published in 1978 by Jossey-Bass Publishers of San Francisco and is available at $13.95 a copy.

APPENDIX I

PROGRAM EVALUATION LITERATURE

May 1980

Anderson, S., & Ball, S. The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978

Attkission, C. C., et al. (Eds.) Evaluation of Human Service Programs. New York: Academic Press, 1978

Bernstein, I. N. & Freeman, H. E. Academic and Entrepreneurial Research: The Consequences of Diversity in Federal Evaluation Studies. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1975

Bolton, B. Handbook of Measurement and Evaluation. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976

Brown, G. F., & Wedel, K. R. Assessing Training Needs. Washington, D.C.: National Training and Development Service Press, 1978

Campbell, D. T., & Cook, T. D. The Design and Analysis of Quasi-experiments for Field Settings. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978

Caro, F. G. (Ed.) Readings in Evaluation Research, Second Edition. New York: Russel Sage, 1977

Cook, D. W., Cooper, P. G. Fundamentals of Evaluation Research in Vocational Rehabilitation. Arkansas: Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, 1978

Cook, T. D., & Reichardt, C. S. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979

Coursey, R. D. (Ed.) Program Evaluation for Mental Health: Methods, Strategies, and Participants. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1977

Davidoff, I., Guttentag, M., & Offut, J. (Ed.) Evaluating Community Mental Health Services: Principles and Practice. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978

Epstein, I., & Tripodi, T. Research Techniques for Program Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977

Fitz-Gibbon, C. T., & Morris L. L. How to Design a Program Evaluation. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1979

Fitz-Gibbon, C. T., & Morris, L. L. Evaluators Handbook. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978

Henerson, M. E., Lyons, L. M., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. How To Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978

Harrison, A. W., Jr. Evaluation In Legislation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979

Manner, J. V. The Process of Program Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: National Training and Development Service Press, 1978

Perloff, R. Evaluator Interventions: Pros and Cons. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979

Rich, R. F. Translating Evaluation into Policy (Vol. 3). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979

Robinault, I. P. Program Planning & Evaluation: Selected Topics for Vocational Rehabilitation.

Rossi, P. N., Freeman, H. E. & Wright, S. R. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979

Schulberg, H. C., Sheldon, A., Baker, F. Program Evaluation in Health Fields. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1979

Sze, W. C., Hoppe, J. G. Evaluation and Accountability in Human Service Programs, Second Edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1978

Suchman, E. Evaluative Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967

APPENDIX II

PERIODICALS AND JOURNALS
RELATING TO REHABILITATION AND EVALUATION

April 1980

REHABILITATION-RELATED PERIODICALS

American Rehabilitation

Publisher: Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), DE
Bi-monthy publication

Business Office:
Superintendent of Documents
P.O. Box 1533
Washington, D.C. 20402

Editor:
Rehabilitation Services ADministration
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Informer

Publisher: Arkansas Rehabilitation Research & Training Center (RT-13)
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Arkansas Research
Arkansas Rehabilitation Research & Training Center
P.O. Box 1358
Hot Springs, Arkansas 71901

Editor:
Same

Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling

Publisher: National Rehabilitation Counseling Association
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
National Rehabilitation Association
1522 "K" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Editor:
University of Texas at Austin
440B Education Building
Austin, Texas 78712

Journal of Rehabilitation

Publisher: National Rehabilitation Association
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
National Rehabilitation Association
1522 "K" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Editor:
Dr. Jack M. Sink
University of Georgia
413 Aderhold
Athens, Georgia 30602

Journal of Rehabilitation Administration

Publisher: The Rehabilitation Services Training Program of DePaul University
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Administration Studies Center
DePaul University
25E Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Editor:
Same

National Rehabilitation Counseling Association: Professional Report

Publisher: National Rehabilitation Counseling Association
Bi-monthly Publication

Business Office:
1522 "K" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin

Publisher: American Personnel and Guidance Association
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Two Skyline Place, Suite 400
5203 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Editor:

Rehabilitation Counseling Program
Christopher Baldy Hall 416
Suny at Buffalo
Amherst, New York 14260

Rehabilitation Gazette

Publisher: Rehabilitation Gazette Volunteer Staff
Annual Publication

Business Office:

Rehabilitation Gazette
4502 Maryland Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Editor:

Same

Rehabilitation Literature

Publisher: National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children & Adults
10 Issues

Business Office:

2023 West Ogden Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60612

Editor:

Same

Rehabilitation World

Publisher: Rehabilitation International USA
Quarterly Publication

Circulation Department
Rehabilitation Department
20 West 40th Street
New York, New York 10018

EVALUATION-RELATED PERIODICALS

Evaluation

Publisher: Minneapolis Medical Research Foundation, Inc.
Quarterly

Circulation Manager
Evaluation
501 South Park Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Evaluation Review: A Journal of Applied Social Research

Publisher: Sage Publications
Quarterly

Business Office:
Sage Publications
275 South Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90212

Editor:
Richard A. Buck
Department of Sociology
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance

Publisher: American Personnel and Guidance Association
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Two Skyline Place
Suite 400
5203 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Editor:
Dr. Larry Loesch
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis

Publisher: American Educational Research Association
Bi-monthly Publication

Business Office:
1230 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Editor:
W. J. Popham
S. M. W. Kirst

Evaluation and the Health Profession; A Multiprofessional Journal

Publisher: Sage Publications
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Sage Publications
275 South Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90212

Editors:
R. B. Bansell
C. A. Waltz
School of Nursing
University of Maryland
655 West Lombard
Baltimore, Maryland 20201

Evaluation and Program Planning

Publisher: Research and Evaluation Services
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
Program on Press
Fairview Park
Elmford, New York 10523

Editor:
J. A. Morrell
Department of Health Sciences
Hahnemann Medical College
112 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Health Policy Quarterly: Evaluation and Utilization

Publisher: Human Sciences Press
Quarterly Publication

Business Office:
H. S. P.
72 5th Avenue
New York, New York 10011

Editors:
H. C. Schulberg
E. Ricci

APPENDIX III

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MODEL EVALUATION
UNITS PROJECT

Representatives from Rehabilitation Services Administration

Robert L. Davis, Director, Division
of Resource Management
Department of Education
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Room 3230
Washington, D.C. 20201 (202) 245-0085

Wesley W. Geigel, Director
Division of Rehabilitation Facilities
Room 3329-S
Mary E. Switzer Building
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201 (202) 245-0076

Lawrence I. Mars
Statistician & Leader of the
Data Analysis Team
Mary E. Switzer Building
Room 3117-S
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C 20201 (202) 245-0080

William Massie, Coordinator
Innovation & Expansion Grant Program
Room 3418-S
Mary E. Switzer Building
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201 (202) 245-0316

Regional Office - Rehabilitation Services Administration

Harold D. Viaille, Ph.D.
Acting RSA Regional Program Director
Department of Education
Regional Office for Rehabilitation Services
Region VI
1200 Main Tower Building, Suite 2040
Dallas, Texas 75202 (214) 767-2961

Frank Campbell
Office of Rehabilitation Services
Department of Education
Region X
Arcade Building
1321 Second Avenue (MS505)
Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 442-5331

CSAVR Group

John M. Coburn, Ph.D., Director
Assistant State Superintendent in
Vocational Rehabilitation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 8717
Baltimore, Maryland 21240 (301) 796-8300

Robert W. Dingwall, Ed.D.
Director, Division of Vocational
Rehabilitation
Department of Health & Social Services
Room 327, Hathaway State Office Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002 (307) 777-7389

Mr. Terry Etling
Deputy Administrator
Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission
4656 Heaton Road
Columbus, Ohio 43229 (614) 438-1220

Lowell E. Green
Administrative Assistant, Rehabilitative
and Visual Services
Public Welfare Commission
Department of Institutions, Social
and Rehabilitative Services
Sequoyah Memorial Office Building
P.O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125 (405) 521-2907

Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute

Don Harrison, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Director
University of Michigan
Rehabilitation Research Institute
1323 School Education Building
610 E. University
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109 (313) 763-4795

Research Utilization Laboratory-ICD Rehabilitation & Research Center

Mr. Marvin Weisinger
Associate Supervisor
RUL-ICD
340 East 24th Street
New York, New York 10010 (212) 679-0100, Ext. 282 or 288

Oklahoma Rehabilitation Administration & Management Program

Mr. L. H. Autry
Director of Rehabilitation Administration
and Management Programs
University of Oklahoma
1700 ASP Avenue, Building 158
Norman, Oklahoma 73073 (405) 325-4913

Research Utilization Specialist

Thomas E. Backer, Ph.D., Senior Staff Associate
Human Interaction Research Institute
10889 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1120
Los Angeles, California 90024 (213) 879-1373

Consumer Representative

Ms. Kathy Miller
Deputy Director
Center of Handicapped Affairs
1026 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48912 (517) 485-5887

RSA Management Information System Representative

Ron Geddes
ABT Associates
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 (617) 492-7100

Contract Representatives

Richard Dodson, Ph.D.
Berkeley Planning Associates
1912 Bonita Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704 (415) 549-3492

National Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
5530 Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 955
Washington, D.C. 20015 (301) 654-5882

Gary Prazak
Walker & Associates
123 East Grant Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403 (612) 870-4420

Richard A. Nida, Ph.D.
West Virginia Research & Training Center
#1 Dunbar Plaza, Suite E
Dunbar, West Virginia 25064 (304) 766-7138

Project Officers

James E. Taylor, Ph.D.
Project Officer
Coordinating & Model Unit Contract
Room 3529, MES
Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20201 (202) 245-3379

Harold Kay, Ed.D.
Assistant Project Officer
Coordinating & Model Unit Contract
Task II
Office of Human Development
Office of Rehabilitation Services
3535 Market Street
P.O. Box 13716
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101 (596-1330

Ms. Anita McQuillen
Co-Project Director on the Facilities Reporting System Contract
Department of Education
330 "C" Street, S.W.
Mary E. Switzer Building
Room 3327
Washington, D.C. 20201 (202) 234-0077

Model Units

Guy Veach
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, Delaware (302) 571-2874

Robert Struthers, Ph.D.
State of Michigan
Department of Education
Vocational Rehabilitation Services
P.O. Box 30010
Lansing, Michigan 48909 (517) 373-3970

Wendell Cox
Vocational Rehabilitation for the Blind
P.O. Box 4872
Jackson, Mississippi 39216 (601) 354-7704

Neil Sherwood
Vocational Rehabilitation Division
Department of Human Resources
2045 Silverton Road, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310 (503) 378-3830

William Jenkins, Ed.D.
Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation
Labor & Industry Building
7th and Forster Streets
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 (717) 787-7312

W. H. Brownfield
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation
4901 Fitzhugh Avenue
P.O. Box 11045
Richmond, Virginia 23230 (804) 257-0271

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1980-0-629-819/6010